

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, 1905.

The Remonstrance is published annually by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

State Organizations Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Thirty-two Branch Committees, members in 234 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD, President.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY, } Vice-
MRS. EMMET B. DEAPER, } Presidents.
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Recording Sec'y.
MISS L. C. POST, Cor. Sec'y,
P. O. Box 134, Brookline.

MAINE COMMITTEE.

MRS. CHARLES S. OGDEN, President, Portland.
MRS. SIDNEY W. THAXTER, Secretary, "
MRS. MELVIN P. FRANK, Treasurer, "
MRS. JAMES P. BAXTER, "
MRS. CLARENCE H. CORNING, "
MRS. F. A. QUINBY, "
MISS LOUISA SPRING, "
MISS CATHERINE P. TALBOT, "
MISS HANNAH L. TALBOT, "
MISS MARY KING LONGFELLOW, "
MISS MARION RICHMOND WEEKS, "
MISS FLORENCE McMULLAN, "
MRS. JOHN M. GLIDDEN, Newcastle.
MRS. P. M. BLAKE, Bangor.
MRS. JOHN F. THOMPSON, Portland.
MISS ANNIE C. CHILD, Augusta.

NEW YORK.

MRS. LYMAN ABBOTT, President.
MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, 1st Vice-President.
MRS. ELIHU ROOT,
MRS. RICHARD WATSON GILDER,
MRS. WILLIAM PUTNAM, } Vice-
MRS. PHILIP SCHUYLER VAN } Presidents.
PATTEN,
MRS. WILLIAM J. WALLACE,
MRS. GEORGE PARKHURST,
MRS. GEORGE WADDINGTON, Treasurer.
MRS. GEORGE PHILLIPS, Secretary,
377 West End Avenue, New York City.

Chairmen of Auxiliaries.

MRS. WILLIAM PUTNAM,
70 Willow Street, Brooklyn.
MRS. PHILIP SCHUYLER VAN PATTEN,
Prospect Avenue, Mt. Vernon.

MRS. W. WINSLOW CRANNELL,
9 Hall Place, Albany.
MRS. GEORGE PARKHURST,
500 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo.

ILLINOIS.

MRS. CAROLINE F. CORBIN, President.
MRS. S. M. NICKERSON, } Vice-Presidents.
MRS. E. J. OGLESBY, }
MRS. HORATIO N. MAY, }
MRS. JAMES B. BARNET, Secretary,
463 Elm Street, Chicago.

OREGON.

MRS. WALLACE McCAMANT, President.
MRS. W. T. LADD, 1st Vice-President.
MRS. J. B. MONTGOMERY, 2d Vice-President.
MRS. F. P. MAYE, Treasurer.
MISS ELEANOR GILE, Secretary.
MRS. E. W. WILBUR, Cor. Secretary,
750 Lovejoy Street, Portland.

IOWA COMMITTEE.

MRS. J. H. MERRILL, 500 W. Fourth Street,
Des Moines.
MRS. MARTIN FLYNN, Des Moines.
MISS EMILY STOWE, Des Moines.
MRS. SIMON CASADY, Des Moines.

RHODE ISLAND COMMITTEE.

Providence.
MRS. WILLIAM ELY, Chairman.

WASHINGTON COMMITTEE.

Seattle.
MRS. JOHN LEARY, President.
MRS. T. B. HARDIN, Vice-President.
MRS. G. W. BACON, Secretary,
512 10th Avenue, South.
MRS. ALFRED DOWNING, Treasurer.
Tacoma.
MRS. CHAUNCEY W. GRIGGS, President.
MRS. FITCH B. STACEY, Vice-President.
MRS. A. B. BULL, Secretary,
33 N. E. Street.

A WORD TO LEGISLATORS.

Most of the state legislatures are in session this winter. To a considerable number of them woman suffrage measures of one sort or another will be presented. They may be asked to confer offhand upon women, without even a reference of the question to the people, the highest form of suffrage,—the right to vote for Presidential electors; or to take favorable action upon proposed amendments to state constitutions giving to women the right to vote on the same footing as men; or to confer upon women, with or without limitations, the municipal ballot; or to

give to women some minor form of the suffrage.

What shall be the attitude of legislators toward these proposals?

Many men, at first thought, are moved by a kind of chivalry when such measures come before them for action. They are told that women want the suffrage, and their first impulse is to say that, in that case, they ought to have it. The women who ask the ballot are in the habit of pressing their claims by an appeal to the chivalry of men. They tell legislators that it is not magnanimous in them to refuse to women the privilege which they, themselves, value highly and which they have the power to confer.

But a little reflection will show legislators that the question is not one to be decided by appeals to personal generosity. It is a question that vitally concerns the institutions of society and the state. Legislators are representatives of the people, bound in honor to respect the wishes of their constituents, so far as they know them. If this question of giving the ballot to women had entered into the canvass and legislators had been elected with reference to it, that would be another matter. But where legislators have been chosen wholly with reference to other issues, they may well hesitate before giving their sanction to so revolutionary a change in political institutions as is involved in giving to women the ballot.

Even if it were true that women want the ballot, the gift of it should not be made unless it is clear that it is for their good, and not only that, but that it is for the good of the community as a whole. Rarely has there been a question in which the burden of proof rested so plainly with those making a claim as in this matter of giving the ballot to women,

and rarely has there been a question in which this obligation has been so studiously avoided.

If women wanted the ballot, that fact would not be conclusive, in any case, as to the expediency of giving it to them. But in point of fact, they do not want it. The great majority of women either are indifferent to the suffrage or are actively opposed to it. Suffragists themselves admit this. Any legislator may verify the statement by inquiries among the women of his acquaintance. In Vermont, at the annual meeting of the State Woman Suffrage Association, last July, the report of the secretary showed a total membership of 151. Legislature after legislature in Vermont has been entreated to give the ballot to women; but what right have the 151 persons in the Vermont Woman Suffrage Association to assume to express the sentiments of the women of the state? In Massachusetts, when the women of the state were invited to express themselves regarding the expediency of giving the municipal ballot to women, less than four per cent. of the women of voting age signified their wish to have the ballot. Always it is a minority, and usually a small minority, of women who ask for the suffrage.

THE REMONSTRANCE is published by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. This Association is composed wholly of women of twenty-one years or over. According to official count in May, 1904, it had 10,758 members in 234 cities, towns, and villages, who have manifested their active opposition to the grant of the ballot to women by enrolling themselves for that purpose. It is affiliated with associations and committees with similar aim, also composed exclusively of women, in New York, Illinois, Maine, Oregon, Iowa, Washington, Rhode Island, and other states. It is the belief of these associations that they speak for the enormous majority of their sex when they deprecate the extension of the suffrage to women; and it is in behalf of this majority that the associations

ask legislators to reject suffrage propositions.

UNDEMOCRATIC.

Two years ago, bills to confer the suffrage upon tax-paying women were introduced in half a dozen legislatures and were defeated in all of them. It is anticipated that similar bills will be pressed before several legislatures the present season.

If there were no other reason for opposing these propositions, they ought to be rejected because they are undemocratic and alien to the spirit of American institutions. The principle on which they are based, if applied to both sexes, would disfranchise every American voter who did not pay taxes upon property. To apply this principle to one half the electorate and not to the other would be a glaring inconsistency; yet what legislature would vote to disfranchise non-taxpaying male voters?

When the suffragists put forward such bills, they disregard all the arguments which they have hitherto made on the ground of justice to woman as woman. They intimate that it is not character, or intelligence which qualifies for the ballot, but the possession of property. They ask legislatures to discriminate against the vast majority of women, no matter what their intelligence or capacity, in favor of comparatively few, who own property in their own right and are taxed upon it.

A THIRD PARTY?

THE Denver (Colorado) *Times* of October 12, 1904, reported a meeting of the Colorado Equal Suffrage Association held that morning, which endorsed Mr. Adams for governor, Mr. Ammons for lieutenant-governor, and Mr. Shafroth for congressman, for the reason thus stated:

The Equal Suffrage Association desires the announcement made that this indorsement has been given solely from the standpoint of the equal suffragist and not because of the political affiliations of the candidates approved.

This action suggests that the suffragists may constitute themselves practically a third party, approving

candidates not because of their personal character or their political principles, but solely with reference to their attitude toward woman suffrage.

NOT THE SAME THING.

REFERENCE is frequently made to the use of the local ballot by women in England, as if it offered a parallel to the municipal suffrage or tax-paying suffrage proposition urged upon American legislatures.

But the privilege exercised by English women is not at all the same thing that is asked for American women. The political rights given to women in local government in England *are not given them on equal terms with men*. For example, no woman can vote merely because she is an owner of property, but she must be an occupier. No woman can vote as a lodger; and there is no service franchise for women corresponding to that exercised by men who occupy buildings as officials, janitors, or servants.

A CHANGED SITUATION.

THERE are two considerations, either or both of which might warrant the extension of suffrage to women. One is the conviction that the condition of women would be thereby improved; the other is the belief that the State would be benefited by woman's exercise of the suffrage. But these demonstrations of woman's hostility to the ballot strike at both these considerations. It is hard for legislators to believe that, if the ballot were likely to be a benefit to women, less than four per cent. of them would ask for it. It is equally hard for them to believe that the ballot, imposed upon a body of voters so reluctant to accept or use it, could be an instrument for the improvement of politics or the regeneration of society. It seems, therefore, not rash to conclude that the check to the woman suffrage movement in the United States, following closely, as it has, upon the organized opposition of women to it, represents not a coincidence merely, but cause and effect. In this case, *post hoc* is *propter hoc*.—From "The Check to Woman Suffrage in the United States," by Frank Foxcroft, in *The Nineteenth Century* for November, 1904.

THE PRESS ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

TIME WASTED.

(From the St. Louis *Post-Despatch*, May 20, 1904.)

UNTIL women really want to vote it is time wasted to talk about it. But no woman need feel that she is not a positive social element, a factor in healthy progress, merely because she has no vote.

WOMAN'S VOTE IN AUSTRALIA.

(From the Liverpool, England, *Echo*, January 27, 1904.)

It is sufficient to know that in Australia, as previously in New Zealand, the exercise of the Parliamentary franchise by women has proved a very tame and humdrum affair, failing to accomplish the result, anticipated in some quarters, of checking the growth of Socialism, which is stronger than ever, with an appreciable gain of representation in the Federal Senate.

NEGLECT OF THE SCHOOL BALLOT.

(From the North Adams *Transcript*, April 18, 1904.)

WOMAN suffragists of Massachusetts celebrated in Boston, Saturday, the silver jubilee of the granting of the suffrage on school questions to women in this state. The gathering was held in Faneuil Hall, and there was general jubilation over the number of states which have followed the Massachusetts example during the past quarter of a century.

It was noticeable, however, that outside of a resolution urging the women voters of the state to increase their activity and enlarge their numbers, very little was said about the lack of regard for the voting privilege on the part of the women of the state. In the addresses, comparatively little attention was paid to this, which is one of the most important features of the question.

WOMEN NOT INTERESTED.

(From the Providence *Journal*, May 1, 1904.)

CAN any proof be offered that the majority of women will vote if they have the opportunity, and that they will use the power well? Will not a large proportion of those whose votes would count for political righteousness neglect the opportunity, even as their brothers do, thus leaving the real power in the hands of an element quite as undesirable as its complement in the present voting population? The fear that some such state of affairs would surely come to pass, not any desire to act the rôle of oppressor or to rob woman of her birthright, causes the majority of thinking men to doubt the wisdom, for the present, at least, of granting the suffrage to women. If there were any marked display of interest on the subject among women, the arguments of their self-appointed champions would have greater weight. As this is not the case, we must conclude that the demand is not an urgent one.

WOMAN'S VOTE IN ENGLAND.

(From the Leeds *Post*, March 17, 1904.)

WHAT is the experience of the country in the matter of the admission of women to the municipal franchise? So far as we can learn, it is by no means wholly good; most people of experience in municipal elections look upon it with disfavor. The fact suggests at least very careful consideration.

AMENDING "AMERICA."

(From *The Congregationalist*, March 5, 1904.)

THE National Woman's Suffrage convention has voted to change the line in our national hymn, "Our fathers' God, to thee," making it read, "Our Father, God, to thee." This was done because the hymn was said to ignore our mothers. An organization so sensitively feminine as to perpetrate such a piece of foolishness as this can hardly hope to fight its way to suffrage in this rough world.

FRAUDS IN COLORADO.

THERE was an unusual scene in the national House of Representatives, February 15, 1904, when Representative Shafroth of Colorado resigned his seat in favor of Mr. R. W. Bonyne because he had become convinced that fraudulent votes had been cast for his election and that he had been the beneficiary of them, although without knowledge of them, or share in them at the time.

The testimony, covering two thousand closely printed pages, taken by the committee of Congress which investigated this case, showed that some of the most glaring frauds in Denver had been committed by women. The *New York Times* of February 21, 1904, published a summary of the testimony of Mrs. Beatrice Muhlemann, who admitted her participation in the frauds. She testified to marking ballots in different styles of handwriting, and making them correspond with the poll-book, and to giving directions to women who were to do repeating at the polls. Two other women were associated with her in the manipulation of the ballots, one of whom arranged to have a fight started at the election place to afford a chance to throw out the watchers and challengers of the other party.

The details of this incident are not pleasant reading for women, whatever views they may entertain upon the suffrage. Mr. Shafroth himself, says that "of the persons implicated, very few were women, not more than one in ten at the outside." It would clearly be unjust to assume from

these occurrences that any large number of Colorado women were capable of election frauds. But the incident illustrates the danger which inheres in the suffrage movement, that one result of bringing women into the turmoil of politics will be to dull the moral sense of a certain proportion of them, and to lead them to unscrupulous acts. The reports of the last election in the Colorado papers, and the arrest of a woman in Denver on the charge of election frauds, indicate that the practices which invalidated Mr. Shafroth's election in 1902 were repeated in 1904. Such practices redound to the discredit of woman suffrage because one of the reasons assigned for giving the ballot to women is that it will lead to the elevation and purification of politics.

THE ENGLISH SUFFRAGE MOTION.

MORE weight than it deserves has been given to the vote in the British House of Commons, March 16, 1904, upon Sir Charles McLaren's resolution declaring that the parliamentary franchise ought to be conferred upon women. The *Woman's Journal*, for example, spoke of "the measure" voted on when, in fact, no measure was before the House and none was contemplated. The proposition was merely an academic one, expressed in general terms. There are 670 members of the House of Commons. Of these only 250 voted on the resolution, 182 in favor and 68 opposed.

The real meaning of the vote appears from the comments of some of the leading English papers. The *London Morning Advertiser* of March 17, for example, said:

In a similar spirit of levity and unreality the question was approached last night, perhaps even with more levity, for while a Bill always means something, and may conceivably blossom into an Act, a resolution counts for just as much or little as the House on any future occasion may choose.

And the *Sheffield Independent* of March 18 remarked:

Every session sees this woman suffrage question brought up before Parliament in one form or another; and every session hears the same jests, the same compliments to the fair sex, and the same insults alleged or actual. In those far-distant future days, when common sense has achieved a success over pedantry, and the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill has become law, one imagines that woman suffrage will be the acknowledged hardy annual of Parliament.

PHILANTHROPY WITH A PURPOSE.

THE latest plan of the suffrage associations is to enter into various philanthropies with a view to promoting the suffrage cause. At the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association at Attleboro, as reported in the *Woman's Journal* for October 29, 1904, this method was spoken of humorously as "sugar-coated pills." The annual report of Mrs. Mary H. Page, chairman of the state board of directors, declared, "We must join hands with all the other forces making for good if we wish to advance our cause," and reported that during the year invitations had been secured to speak before women's clubs, granges and other organizations, "thus carrying our gospel quite outside the customary round of our own leagues." At the same meeting Miss Blackwell gave the following counsel:

"Many of the speakers who lecture before women's clubs are believers in suffrage. When any such is to speak before the club on any subject, ask him or her privately, in advance, to bring in a few words in favor of suffrage. Most of them would be quite willing."

With philanthropies and public causes entered into with the ulterior purpose of promoting woman suffrage, and general lecturers before women's clubs "privately" asked in advance to bring in a few words in favor of suffrage, it would seem that the suffrage leagues ought to have a larger membership than they are able to report. At the Attleboro meeting, Mr. Henry B. Blackwell reported the total enrollment in the state at 12,864, which includes both men and women.

THE prime duty of the man is to work, to be the breadwinner; the prime duty of the woman is to be the mother, the housewife. All questions of tariff and finance sink into utter insignificance when compared with the tremendous, the vital importance of trying to shape conditions so that these two duties of the man and of the woman can be fulfilled under reasonably favorable circumstances. — *President Roosevelt, in annual message to Congress, December 6, 1904.*

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1903.

In Kentucky, the legislature repealed the law which had allowed women to vote for school officers in second-class cities. In Connecticut, the constitutional convention rejected a resolution giving women the full right of suffrage. In Massachusetts, tax-paying and license suffrage bills and a resolve for a suffrage constitutional amendment were defeated. In New York, a bill to give women in third-class cities the right to vote upon tax propositions failed, and the legislature passed a bill repealing the law of 1892, which gave women in towns the right to vote for school commissioners, on the ground that it was unconstitutional. In Vermont, the legislature rejected Presidential suffrage and municipal suffrage bills, and refused to admit women to the vote on the local option referendum.

IN 1902.

In Arizona, a bill conferring full suffrage upon women was passed by the legislature but was vetoed by the governor. In Kansas and West Virginia, Presidential suffrage bills were defeated. In Connecticut, the House defeated a tax-paying suffrage bill, May 6, 105 to 60. In Illinois, tax-paying and Presidential suffrage bills and a joint resolution for a suffrage amendment were introduced but none of them were favorably acted on. In Maine, a tax-paying suffrage bill was amended in committee so as to make it a general municipal suffrage bill, and in this new draft was defeated in the House by a large majority and in the Senate by a tie vote. In Minnesota and in Rhode Island, Presidential suffrage bills were introduced but failed. In Massachusetts, a tax-paying suffrage bill and a proposed constitutional amendment were defeated. In Montana, a resolution providing for the submission of the suffrage question to the people was killed by the casting vote of the lieutenant-governor. In New Hampshire, at the polls, March 10, a constitutional amendment giving women full suffrage was defeated, receiving only 14,168 votes, against 21,788, when to carry, it should have had two thirds of the total vote cast. In New York, a bill to give tax-paying women in third-class cities the right to vote on propositions submitted at special tax elections was passed by the House but failed in the Senate committee. In Wisconsin, a tax-paying suffrage bill was defeated.

IN 1904.

In Iowa, a proposed constitutional amendment failed to receive the required constitutional majority in the House, the vote being 43 to 40; and in the Senate was indefinitely postponed.

In Massachusetts, the committee on election laws reported, 10 to 1 "leave to withdraw" on a municipal suffrage bill and unanimously on a municipal and license suffrage bill. The adverse report on the latter bill was accepted without debate in both houses; that on the former was debated in the House but was accepted without a roll-call, the supporters of the bill being unable to secure the 30 votes needed to demand it.

In New York, bills to allow women to vote for school officers and to vote on questions of raising and spending money in third-class cities failed.

In Ohio, a bill to allow women to vote at local option elections failed.

In Rhode Island, the House, March 24, voted to indefinitely postpone a Presidential suffrage bill.

In Vermont, a tax-paying municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House.

AT A LOW EBB.

THE suffrage cause in Massachusetts is at a low ebb, if the action of the legislature of 1904 upon suffrage proposals may be taken as an indication. On the petitions of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, for full municipal suffrage, including the right to vote at municipal caucuses, the Committee on Election Laws reported "leave to withdraw," 10 to 1. This adverse report was accepted by the House, *viva voce*, after debate, February 16. The suffragists tried to obtain a roll call, but only 24 members rose in favor of a roll call, 30 being necessary. Subsequently, the report was accepted in the Senate, without debate.

On so much of the Governor's address as related to municipal suffrage for women the same committee reported "inexpedient to legislate," 10 to 1. This adverse report was accepted in the House and Senate without debate.

On the petition of Katharine L. Stevenson and Harriet T. Todd, officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Massachusetts, for the right to vote for municipal officers and on the license question, the same committee reported unanimously "leave to withdraw." This adverse report was accepted without debate in the House, April 7, and later in the Senate, in the same manner.

At the hearings before the Commit-

tee on Election Laws upon these petitions, the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women appeared in remonstrance, through its officers, many of its members, representatives of its branches, and others.

On the petition of the officers of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association for the right to vote in caucuses for the nomination of candidates for school committee, the Committee on Election Laws reported "leave to withdraw," 10 to 1. The proposed bill was rejected by the House, 36 to 61, and a motion to reconsider the rejection was defeated, 29 to 88.

THE BOSTON VOTE.

Out of 114,000 male citizens in Boston who were entitled to vote at the municipal election, only 69,000 took the trouble to cast their ballots. — *The Woman's Journal, Dec. 17, 1904.*

This is not quite accurate, though nearly so. The total number of qualified male voters was 114,592. Of these, 71,655, or 62.52 per cent, voted.

But why does the *Woman's Journal* omit to mention the fact that, while 17,119 women were registered, only 8,926 or 52.14 per cent "took the trouble to cast their ballots"? The percentage of women absentees was much larger than that of the other sex, and this notwithstanding the fact that the administration of the schools was the chief issue involved.